

TENT COOPERATION TREATY

LAA/USLM
201
Gmc

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
LEANDRO ARECHEDERRA
EXXONMOBILE CHEMICAL COMPANY
LAW TECHNOLOGY
P.O. BOX 2149
BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 2003B133F		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 22 SEP 2004
International application No. PCT/US03/40858		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International filing date (day/month/year) 19 December 2003 (19.12.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 20 December 2002 (20.12.2002)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): C08F 4/44, 4/32, 136/02, 112/06 and US Cl.: 422/131,138; 526/348,348.7,335,339,144,74,346,90,213,227		
Applicant EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL PATENTS INC.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 20 April 2005 (20.04.2005)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer <i>Den Dijk</i> Roberto Rábago Telephone No. (703) 308-0661
---	--

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

ACKNOWLEDGED
PATENT LEGAL ASSISTANT GROUP
G. M. CARROLL

SEP 29 2004

☒ FYI
☐ Reminder
☐ File

EMCLT
BAYTOWN

SEP 28 2004

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-107, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 108-121, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-5, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International Application No.
PCT/US03/40858

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-58</u>	YES
	Claims <u>59</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>1-58</u>	YES
	Claims <u>59</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-59</u>	YES
	Claims _____	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claim 59 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by each individually of Kim et al. (US 6,303,715) and Kruger et al. (US 6,346,587) as cited on the International search report. Claim 59 includes all polymers made by any of the methods recited in the preceding claims, such polymers lacking any specific properties whatsoever. Accordingly, given both the breadth of polymers made by the recited methods and the lack of any basis to believe that polymers across such breadth would be substantively unique on the basis of their method of manufacture, the polymers exemplified in each of the cited references would be within the scope of claim 59, and therefore the claim lacks novelty.

Claims 1-58 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the combination of using an HFC diluent in combination with a reactor comprising a bayonet. The prior art has described bayonette heat exchangers (see Derwent 1992-022267 and Derwent 1998-330861 as cited on the International Search Report) and has also described the use of HFC diluents in polymerization methods (examples of Kruger et al (US '587)); however, given the vast array of possible reactor configurations and polymerization methods available in the art, no suggestion can be found to combine these two particular components into a single method.

Claims 1-59 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/40858

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.